REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 through 3 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims.

Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,221,526 to Tanishita in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,753,671 to Harvey.

The Present Invention

The present invention provides a connector for charging a mobile phone in which a light emitting element integrated with the connector changes its color according to an amount of a charging voltage being supplied to the mobile phone (or other device) through the connector. The connector includes an upper and lower cover. In a particular embodiment, the upper cover forms a hole that secures a protective window.

U.S. Patent No. 6,221,526 to Tanishita

U.S. Patent No. 6,221,526 to Tanishita ("Tanishita") teaches an auxiliary power source device for a portable electronic instrument. It includes an "attaching terminal" 2 (see, e.g., Figures 1-4). The Examiner acknowledges that Tanishita does not disclose a light emitting element disposed on a printed circuit board that is electrically connected to a mobile phone by a pin. The Examiner

further acknowledges that Tanishita does not disclose a light emitting element configured as above that changes color from yellow, red and green, in order, according to an amount of charging voltage being provided by the power source. In fact, Tanishita does not disclose a light of any kind in its connector.

U.S. Patent No. 6,753,671 to Harvey

U.S. Patent No. 6,753,671 to Harvey ("Harvey") teaches a recharger for use with a portable electronic device and which includes a proximally located light emitting device. The light emitting device (1) flashes at a steady frequency as an indication that normal charging is occurring; (2) goes to a steady state "on" condition when the battery is fully charged; and (3) when fully charged and the device is running and still connected to the charger, the light emitting device will occasionally flash as an indication that the power being expended from the battery is being replaced on a periodic basis. So the light emitting device "informs" a user of three states of operation.

The Examiner has not Established a *prima facie* Case of Obviousness

As set forth in the MPEP:

> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skilled in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.
> MPEP 2143

The Examiner acknowledges that Tanishita contains no teaching or suggestion of a connector having a multi-color indicator or LED disposed on a printed circuit board that is electrically

connected to a mobile phone by a pin, whereby the indicator/LED changes its color according to an amount of a charging voltage. Applicant acknowledges that Harvey teaches an indicator disposed on a connector. However, neither Harvey nor Tanishita teach or suggest an indicator that changes colors *based on the amount of charging voltage being delivered by the charging circuit* associated with the connector.

The present invention as claimed in independent claim 1 is a connector for coupling to or separating from a mobile phone. The connector includes a light emitting element, and the light emitting element changes its color *from yellow, red, and green in order according to the amount of charging voltage.* These elements are all specifically claimed in independent claim 1, and are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references. If one were to combine the Tanishita and Harvey references as proposed by the Examiner, at best the result would be a connector having an indicator that changes its operational state based on charging functions, not based on the amount of charging voltage being replaced, as is claimed. Without such a teaching or suggestion of changing colors based on the amount of voltage being applied, the combination of Tanishita and Harvey proposed by the Examiner does not render the claimed invention obvious.

The dependant claims include these same elements and for this reason are also patentable over the Tanishita/Harvey combination. In addition, the dependent claims include additional elements not taught or suggested by the Tanishita/Harvey combination, including the inclusion of a protective window that covers the LED to protect it from harm during use. For these additional reasons, the claims are in allowable condition. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims.

Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 19-5425.

Respectfully submitted

February 8, 2008
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Registration No. 32,942

SYNNESTVEDT LECHNER & WOODBRIDGE LLP
112 Nassau Street
P.O. Box 592
Princeton, NJ 08542

Telephone: (609) 924 3773
Facsimile: (609) 924 1811
Email: MSimpson@synnlech.com